

year, jeopardizing the progress we have made in reversing environmental degradation, slowing population growth, preventing the spread of deadly disease, building economic self-sufficiency, promoting democracy, resolving conflicts peacefully, stemming the flow of illegal drugs and countering the threat of nuclear proliferation. All of these are very important objectives.

Consulates have been closed and embassy staffs reduced all over the world, making it impossible to provide the services that Americans abroad expect and deserve. We have closed 30 posts abroad since 1993, and 13 more are slated for closure this year.

Some of this scrubdown of posts needed to be done. But once again, I think we have gone beyond the point of diminishing returns and we now are really eroding our capacity to carry out an effective foreign policy.

While some question the importance of ambassadors and embassies in an era of CNN, supersonic travel, and instant global communication, I think this skepticism is misplaced. We need to have our ambassadors and their embassy teams on the ground, around the globe promoting human rights, conflict resolution, antiterrorism and counter-narcotics cooperation, U.S. economic interests and U.S. exports, for example. Many of the embassies have significantly improved their performance by working with the American business community in a very significant and substantial way.

We need consular officers to assist U.S. visitors and business people, to issue visas, replace lost passports and cut through redtape when Americans run into difficulties abroad. We need them to spread good will, to exemplify American values and to deal with sensitive situations before they become full-blown emergencies. This experienced corps of professionals is the face of our Nation around the world.

Yet our diplomatic service is forced to rely on computer software, office equipment, buildings and services that are outmoded, unreliable, inefficient, and sometimes even unsafe. Diplomacy in the 1990's is being carried out on the technology of the 1960's and 1970's, and no relief is in sight.

These cuts are particularly troubling when juxtaposed to very large, unrequested increases in defense spending. The budget adds almost as much for defense, over and above the amount the Pentagon asked for, than is spent on the entire foreign aid budget for a year. In other words, we are cutting substantially the 150 account, our diplomacy account, our political and economic interest account, at the same time that we are increasing the military account over and above what the Pentagon sought.

It seems to me a matter of common sense that by investing a little bit in preventive diplomacy you may be able to address situations while they are amenable to economic and political solutions rather than wait until they be-

come full-blown crises and require the presence of our military. By sacrificing investment in preventive political and economic measures, we will only be postponing and probably escalating the ultimate costs.

Of course, effective diplomacy is enhanced by a strong military and the readiness to apply it, but our military strength ought not to become our prime recourse for influencing situations in the international arena. In fact, I think the task of the next century will be to hone our diplomatic, economic, and political skills so that we can protect our interests without having to put our troops in harm's way.

It is increasingly clear that in the 21st century American interests in the world will be heavily economic and political. We need to ensure open markets and fair trade to promote American prosperity. We need to avert conflicts that will cause human suffering, refugee flows, environmental destruction, and economic dislocation. We must combat international terrorism and prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

None of these goals can be achieved on a unilateral basis. None of them can be undertaken by military action alone. And none of them can be achieved without sufficient resources. The 150 account is important to meeting our responsibilities as a world leader. By not allocating adequate resources, we may indeed encounter disastrous consequences. Further cuts are not just ill-conceived; they are downright dangerous to our national security and to achieving American objectives around the world.

I urge my colleagues, although I know it runs against a perception of popular sentiment, to examine carefully what we are doing to our ability as a nation to carry out our responsibilities as a world leader. It cannot be done if we do not commit the resources with which to do it. And we now have reached the point where I think we have so drastically reduced our commitment in this area that we are markedly affecting our ability to act as a world leader.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and I thank the distinguished ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Did the Senator want to speak at this point?

Mr. EXON. No. I was just going to try and get embodied in an agreement what we had arranged for. The Senator from Delaware would like 3 or 4 minutes on another subject. I would like time likewise. Then we had general agreement that we would go to Senator GRASSLEY with his amendment. We have all agreed to that, and I would just like to suggest it.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator from Delaware wanted to 2 minutes.

Mr. EXON. OK. I will follow the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. DOMENICI. I will yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 2 minutes.

#### THE RESIGNATION OF BOB DOLE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the news by our esteemed majority leader that he will be resigning both his leadership post and his Senate seat is, indeed, bittersweet. I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues when I say that the Senate will miss BOB DOLE—his intelligence, his courage, his love for his country, and his unparalleled leadership skills. In Europe, 50 years ago, as a young lieutenant, BOB DOLE was willing to make the ultimate sacrifice for his country in war. And today for the sake of his country and the Congress, BOB DOLE is willing to leave the job he loves because he loves his country and Congress so much. This is a bold move by a man whose life has been the ultimate story of courage. America needs his courage, his moral compass, his leadership in the White House, and this move will enable him to focus much more on the road to the White House.

Because of BOB DOLE's leadership, the 104th Congress will be remembered as the Congress which finally said enough is enough. No more excuses. No more Washington gimmicks. Balance the budget. With BOB DOLE's leadership we have forever altered the debate. The question is no longer whether to balance the budget, but how; not whether to cut taxes, but how; not whether to reduce the size of the Federal bureaucracy, but how; not whether to reform welfare, but how; and not whether to return power to the States, but instead how.

Under BOB DOLE's leadership, the Congress for the first time in four decades passed legislation to balance the Federal budget. BOB DOLE's legacy of leadership in the Senate will only be surpassed by what he will do for America from the White House. I am proud to be a Member of the Dole team, and I will be even prouder to assist a Dole administration next year in carrying out BOB DOLE's agenda for America: lower, fairer, simpler taxes, less Government and a balanced budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, my few remarks about my friend BOB DOLE and his announcement today will be devoid of any political motivations whatsoever.

BOB DOLE has been a friend of mine ever since I came into the Senate. We have differed frequently on many issues, but we have been together on many issues. The announcement today that we heard about this morning came as a considerable shock to this Senator because whatever the future holds, the Senate in my view has lost a tremendously dedicated individual, a talented leader on the Republican side of the aisle, a man I never hesitated a moment in going to on any subject. He

has always been fair to this Senator. We have clashed from time to time on issues. But fairness and confidence and being a very capable Senator and a Senate leader has been the hallmark of BOB DOLE.

I simply say that we will miss him very much in the U.S. Senate, and I would have preferred that he not take the additional step that he announced today with regard to resigning from the Senate. I recognize that in running for President of the United States, it was most difficult to be here, to be a leader. However, I thought the announcement that I read in the papers this morning with regard to Senator DOLE, recognizing that he could not do justice to his Presidential race and be a full-time leader of the Senate and the suggestion that he turn this over to other Members of the Republican majority, seemed to make sense to me. But, for whatever reason, BOB DOLE has made the decision that I think he had to make. I only thank him for the friendship.

I will value the few remaining weeks, week or two or three, that I will have the privilege of serving together with him in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I do not want Senator GRASSLEY to think we are procrastinating and trying to put his amendment off. He is going to have to be absent for just a few minutes.

Mr. President, I will use just a few minutes here as in morning business. I ask my remarks be as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE RESIGNATION OF BOB DOLE

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, the last 3 or 4 hours have been a time of very mixed emotions for many of us. A while ago when we were crammed, all of us Republican Senators, in BOB DOLE's office, when he told us of his desires and wishes, I can say that was a room where grown men, more than one, had a few tears in their eyes, including our distinguished majority leader.

I, for one, will miss him very, very much here in the Senate. But I think when we finally take stock of the U.S. Senate—we are now 208 years old, but if we were to take stock, now, of the 208 years of the U.S. Senate, looking for the giants of the Senate, I am not the least bit reluctant to say that whatever short list one chooses as part of history, BOB DOLE will be among the giants and the real leaders of the U.S. Senate. There is no doubt in my mind, if you take just the last 100 years, that BOB DOLE would once again show up in the top three, four, five U.S. Senators of this entire modern century.

So, obviously, you cannot take somebody like that out of here and not have

a big void. We will clearly miss his leadership and his marvelous ability to tell funny stories and get us off guard and get things done. But essentially his life has been one of real sacrifice for the country. Most Americans do not know that. They have to find out.

BOB DOLE dedicated weeks and months and years to getting his body in the position where he could conduct business and be a Senator after his tragic World War II accident on the front lines. In that, he learned about determination and about fortitude and about strength, and how much strength he really had. He has been giving since then, giving and giving and giving—not to the Senate, but to the American people. And, since he has made the decision that he wants to be President, I, this Senator, wholeheartedly support what he has chosen to do. I hope it is everything he plans it to be, and I think it will be.

He will go to the American people not as the majority leader or Senator, but as a man from Kansas who has sacrificed more than once for this country and will try to do it one more time. I have nothing but great admiration and respect.

My comments to him today are: The very best to you, BOB DOLE. Hopefully, this decision will take you to the White House. If it does, it will be the greatest decision you ever made, and a great decision for America.

But, indeed, there is no question the American people are going to get to find out who BOB DOLE is and what he is all about. And if that is done, it will be a fair election. For if he cannot do that, if the people do not get to know him as he is, it will not be a fair election, not one where he will have the right kind of chance to be President.

So those are my few remarks for today. In time I will say more about him, recalling some of the things we have done together.

With that, I yield to Senator GRASSLEY for his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The Senator from Iowa.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET

The Senate continued with the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield myself as much time as I might consume, but I would like the Chair to notify me when I have 15 minutes left because I want to make sure my cosponsors get ample time to speak on the amendment as well.

Did the Senator from Nebraska want the floor?

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, could I pose a question now so we could establish this? This is the first amendment that is being offered. Do we have time agreements on amendments?

I remember in the opening remarks, the chairman of the committee indicated some time limits on the amendments. For the information of this Sen-

ator and the Senate as a whole, will the Chair please indicate how much time is allotted to the amendment, the first degree? I assume that timeframe would continue unless we get unanimous consent at some future time to change it. What is the agreement on time limits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the Budget Act, there are 2 hours equally divided on first-degree amendments, 1 hour equally divided on second-degree amendments.

Mr. EXON. So there are 2 hours, and 1 hour, half an hour a side, on any amendments to it. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Second-degree. The Senator is correct.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair, and I thank my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I assume that my time is starting right now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has not called up his amendment. We will not proceed until the amendment is at the desk.

AMENDMENT NO. 3963

(Purpose: To reduce defense spending)

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], for himself, Mr. EXON, Mr. KOHL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. FEINGOLD, and Mr. HARKIN, proposes an amendment numbered 3963.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 4, line 8, decrease the amount by \$8,300,000,000.

On page 4, line 17, decrease the amount by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 8, line 3, decrease the amount by \$8,300,000,000.

On page 8, line 4, decrease the amount by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 52, line 11, decrease the amount by \$8,300,000,000.

On page 52, line 12, decrease the amount by \$2,300,000,000.

On page 59, at the end of line 2, insert "This section shall not apply to defense discretionary budget authority and budget outlays caps for fiscal year 1997."

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield myself 15 minutes, Mr. President, off of my time.

For those on the Budget Committee, this amendment attempts to do almost exactly what I did in the Budget Committee, somewhat lower numbers, but also the numbers are not fenced in the truest sense of the word because, under the budget resolution, that would be subject to a point of order, and we wanted to make sure the amendment was germane.

So to the Budget Committee members, we are still trying to reduce the deficit by the amount we are saving on defense. For the rest of the Senate, I want to say my approach is the same, the same goal, lower numbers. We are